APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/645,479	08/24/2000	Udi Manber	17887-003500US	4318

			EXAMINER
20350	7590	12/18/2003	BASEHOAR, ADAM

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cov r sh et with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _24 August 2000_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-25_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-25_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 08/24/00.

2.   Claims 1-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 21, and 22 are independent claims.

Specification

3.   The specification is objected to because of the following informalities:

4.   This application contains a computer program listing of more than three hundred (300) lines. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.96(c), a computer program listing contained on more than three hundred (300) lines, <u>must</u> be submitted as a computer program listing appendix on compact disc conforming to the standards set forth in 37 CFR 1.96(c)(2) and must be appropriately referenced in the specification (see 37 CFR 1.77(b)(4)). Accordingly, applicant is required to cancel the current computer program listing, file a computer program listing appendix on compact disc in compliance with 37 CFR 1.96(c), and insert an appropriate reference to the newly added computer program listing appendix on compact disc at the beginning of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6.   Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-19, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being

anticipated by Freivald et al (5,983,268 11/09/99).

    -In regard to independent claims 1, 12, 21, and 22, Freivald et al teach selecting a web

page (Fig.6: 84) wherein the web page includes a plurality of HTML tags (tokens)(column 3,

lines 32-33), selecting a first area of interest from the web page (column 6, lines 62-64)(Fig. 6:

86) and parsing the page to select a first string of symbols associated with the tags (Fig. 6: 88)

wherein the selected area of interest is identified by the string of symbols (numeric

string)(column 6, line 63). Freivald et al also teach being able to retrieve a second web page and

like the first web page, parsing the web page to determine a second string of symbols associated

with tags that are a second area of interest (Abstract & column 8, lines 62-67) and comparing

(performing calculations) on the first and second strings (varied data)(column 9, lines 3-4) to

determine if they are similar or substantially matching (= or equal to)(column 9, lines 48-59).

    -In regard to dependent claims 2, 5, 17, and 19, Freivald et al teach wherein the user

can define formulas in the spreadsheet to perform calculations on data from different web pages

(columns 8-9, lines 62-67 & 1-4). Freivald et al further teach where the formulas (algorithms)

applied to the first and second numeric strings can be standard arithmetic operators (e.g. "=",

"less than or equal to", "true/false", etc.) (equivalent to pattern matching or regular expression formulas)(column 9, lines 48-59).

-In regard to dependent claims 3 and 16, Freivald et al teach storing the first and second areas of interest in a database (Fig. 6: 96 & 104).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 15, and 23, Freivald et al teach extracting the second area of interest from another web page (Fig. 6: 92) or multiple areas of interest from multiple web pages (Abstract, lines 22-25).

-In regard to dependent claims 6 and 18, Freivald et al teach wherein the first and second areas of interest could include more than one numeric field (distinct sub-areas) from a web page or multiple web pages (Abstract).

-In regard to dependent claims 8 and 13, Freivald et al teach wherein the step of identifying a first area of interest is performed using a manual pointing and selecting device (column 6, lines 54-58).

-In regard to dependent claim 9, Freivald et al teach wherein after the user identifies and selects the areas of interests from two separate web pages and the formulas used for comparison, the remaining steps of parsing and extracting the areas of interest and comparing the two areas of interest are done automatically (Abstract: lines 13-20).

-**In regard to dependent claims 10 and 14**, Freivald et al teach wherein the second web page is retrieved from a remote web site over the Internet (Abstract)(Fig.1: 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 7, 11, 20, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freivald et al (5,983,268 11/09/99) in view of Ohashi (6,408,297 06/18/02).

-**In regard to dependent claim 7**, Freivald et al teach wherein the web page contains HTML tags (column 3, line 33) and wherein the area of interest is a numeric field (string). Freivald et al further teaches wherein most HTML documents have a structure which can be exploited to locate numeric data on a page (column 6, lines 10-11). Freivald et al do not teach wherein structure to identifying the area of interest includes identifying portions of the HTML tags of the page. Ohashi teaches wherein data in numeric fields on HTML pages are stored using tags (Fig. 3A & 3B)(column 7, lines 35-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for the structures used to find the numeric strings in

Freivald et al to have been HTML tags, because Ohashi taught that on structured HTML pages using tags was an easy way to find numeric data (strings).

-In regard to dependent claims 11, 20, and 25, Freivald et al do not teach wherein the HTML tags (tokens) include attributes (elements) and attribute values (text elements). Ohashi teaches that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention for HTML tags (tokens) to have attributes (column 8, line 22) and attribute values (Fig. 12: FONT size = 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for the HTML tags indicating formatting, layout, etc in Freivald et al to have had attributes and attribute values, because HTML attributes and attribute values were very well known in the art of web documents to add increased functionality to HTML tags as was shown in Ohashi et al.

-In regard to dependent claim 24, Freivald et al and Ohashi teach wherein the markup languages are HTML, XML, or SGML (column 6, lines 1-4). Freivald et al and Ohashi do not teach wherein the markup languages could be WML, DHTML, or HDML. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have, to have applied the content extracting method of Freivald et al and Ohashi et al to the WML, DHTML, and HDML markup languages, because all three markup languages were well known at the time of the invention and each markup language would allow the content extracting method to access more media (e.g. WML-wireless devices, HDML-hand held devices and DHTML).

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

US: 6,012,087   01/04/00   Freivald et al.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (703) 305-7212.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

ALB

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER